



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

data." He looks to Experimental Phonetics to gather and classify these data.

On p. 226 will be found an interesting discussion of the pressure of the air in the lungs and in the mouth in speech. We are inclined to doubt the exactness of the statement that: "The lung pressure can hardly be supposed to vary from one sound to another."

Chapter XXV, which treats of the pharynx, nose, velum, lips and jaw, is one of the most instructive in the book. It is impossible in so short a compass to give even the briefest summary. Let us say in passing that we agree with the author in what he says of the t in figure 269, on p. 348, as also his criticism of Josselyn at the top of p. 349. The instrument for registering the vertical movements of the lips, figured on p. 354, is extremely awkward. There is a much simpler and more accurate instrument in use.

The last chapter in the book treats speech rhythm, especially in verse. This chapter will be found most interesting to the increasing number who desire to examine verse structure from a purely mechanical standpoint, which, by the way, is the only one that can ever offer a solution even approximately satisfactory of this vexed question.

RAYMOND WEEKS.

University of Missouri.

---

## PROVENÇAL LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE. II.

2. *Grammaire historique de la langue des Félibres* par EDUARD KOSCHWITZ. Greifswald, Abel; Avignon, Roumanille; Paris, Welter, 1894. 8vo., pp. viii, 183. Price, 4 marks.

There is much more original work in Prof. Koschwitz's "Historical Grammar of the Language of the Félibres." The author, doubtless, has had some predecessors in the grammatical treatment of modern Provençal. He has had the advantage of being allowed to make use of E. Böhmer's notes, which have not appeared in print. He has profited also by Savinian's short grammar, composed for Provençal children. This book, Koschwitz says, has furnished him more than one

useful observation, and he has borrowed from it part of his examples. But the aims of his grammar are entirely different and much higher. He hopes it may render good service also to natives, children as well as adults. However, he has written his work especially for the use of Romance scholars and such foreigners as love the literature of the *Félibres*, and wish to know it by reading the original texts. The point of view from which he looks at, and examines, grammatical phenomena is naturally that of a philologist who goes back to Popular Latin, and, whenever it seems suitable or necessary, to the old Provençal. Indeed, his work is the first scientific or historical grammar of modern Provençal; and it has not yet been superseded by another book.

The grammar is certainly based upon independent research and personal observations. The author is a good observer. I have studied very carefully all the forms and rules given in the grammar, and compared them with Mistral's language in his *Mirèio*. Grammar and language agree perfectly with each other. I doubt that one would arrive at the same result, if one would examine, with the same end in view, the works of all the other *Félibres*, particularly of those who are not natives of the lower Rhône Valley or of Provence proper.

The language of the *Félibres* or what may be called, for the sake of brevity, modern Provençal, is principally derived from the Rhodanian dialect, that is the language spoken by the people, burghers and peasants, in and near Avignon, Orange and Aix. Its vocabulary, as we have already said, is very rich, and is necessarily much richer than that of the popular or rustic dialect in which it had its origin. Its syntax is said to be entirely French. (It is on that account that Koschwitz omits the syntax altogether in his grammar). I doubt it. But it seems to me correct to say that the Provençal language as used by the *Félibres* who are all well educated or even learned men, know French thoroughly and are accustomed to employ the two languages in speaking and writing, is greatly influenced by the syntax of the French language. On the other hand, it seems to me self-understood that the syntax of the popular Rhodanian dialect, however simple it may be, has some features of its own, some features that are

not to be met with in literary French. Everybody knows that this holds true of many popular dialects in the South as well as in the North of France, and even of the popular language spoken in the capital itself.

No doubt, the language of the *Félibres* differs from the natural dialect spoken by the people of the lower Rhône Valley. It has been called by the adversaries of the *Félibrige* an artificial language, created arbitrarily by the efforts of Mistral and his friends and followers. But every literary language, also literary French, is an artificial language. The philologist cannot but approve what Gaston Paris, and, after him, Koschwitz, say in reply to objections and reproaches raised against the very existence of the language of the *Félibres*:

“Si les Provençaux ne réussissent pas dans leur tentative de créer dans la langue de Mistral ou des félibres une littérature complète, et si leur parler indigène ne devient jamais la langue naturelle de leurs entretiens sérieux, ce ne sera pas la faute de l'instrument, mais bien la faute des personnes et de la situation politique et administrative de leur pays. Il n'y a aucun empêchement sérieux dans la langue même: un emprunt plus fréquent de mots abstraits ou savants fait au français aura d'autant moins d'inconvénient que ces mots sont généralement des mots d'emprunt dans le français lui-même et appartiennent, pour la plupart, au jargon savant international. On ne pourra pas refuser aux Provençaux ce que les Français ainsi que tous les autres peuples se permettent journellement; et il n'y a pas de distinction à faire, qu'on habille ces mots savants à la française ou à la provençale.” (Koschwitz, *Mirèio*, Introduction, p. xxxv, note 1).

Thus, I think it is well worth the trouble of every Romance scholar to study seriously not only the literature but also the language of the *Félibres*, and Koschwitz's grammar has its *raison d'être* and must not be considered an object of mere curiosity like a grammar of Volapük. The author deserves our sincere thanks for the time and labor spent upon the composition of his very useful book.

Modern Provençal can be used with great advantage and with much success in elevated, even in solemn style. The poems of Mistral, Aubanel and other *Félibres* prove it abundantly. Nevertheless, it is true that their language, in its vocabulary, has preserved many traces of its rustic

origin. Thus, the general use of certain words that exist in modern French in the same, or a similar, form, or are derived and borrowed from it, and have there a different, more special, only familiar or even comical meaning, appears, at first sight, to the French speaker or to the foreigner, accustomed to read French, very vulgar and so much the more prosy and disagreeable, the finer the verses are in the midst of which the poet has placed them. For example, *drôle* (French *drôle*) quite commonly signifies “boy,” “young man” (*garçon, jeune homme*); *chat* (French *chat*) has a similar signification (*jeune garçon, gars*) and its feminine *chato* (French *chatte*), with its derivative *chatouno* and its diminutive *chatouneto*, is the most usual word to indicate a “girl” or “maiden” (*fillette, jeune fille*). This, however, cannot be considered a serious reproach. For such condition of the vocabulary is naturally the fate of every literary language that is still developing, or has just arisen, out of a popular dialect. The humble or low origin of words is soon forgotten, and the remembrance of their original meaning is entirely lost in the course of time, if they continue to be used with their new and more elevated signification. One cannot pretend that the impression of the stately word *chevalier*, in French, is spoiled, because the philologist knows that it is derived from *cheval*, *CABALLUS*, which had a low and vulgar signification in Classical Latin.

In modern Provençal, according to Koschwitz's grammar, the same grammatical notion, in conjugation, is frequently expressed by several and, sometimes, very different forms. For example, the future of *counèisse* (COGNOSCERE) is *couneirai* or *couneissirai* or *counouissirai* (COGNOSCERE HABEO); the past participle of *naisse* (\*NASCERE) is *na* (NATUM) or *naseu* or *neissegu*; the present subjunctive of *èstre* (\*ESSERE) is *siegue* or *fugue*. It seems to me doubtful that so different forms are all used by the same writer; and it seems to me still more doubtful that they all are found in the same natural dialect, the Rhodanian. Koschwitz ought to tell us if they are employed by different writers according to the region to which they belong, and if they are met with in different dialects of the South. The student surely would like to know how far the literary language of the *Félibres* represents the living, popular Rhodanian dialect

alone or a combination of the Rhodanian with other, neighboring and related, dialects. Conjugation, I think, would offer an excellent opportunity of clearing up this very important question.

It is exceedingly interesting to compare the grammatical facts of Old Provençal and Modern Provençal. But this has to be done with caution, since the two literary languages have their origin, or their principal origin, in different regions. We know that the literary language of the Middle Ages, in Southern France, is based to a large extent on the Limousin dialect.

There is one curious feature of conjugation that all the dialects of Southern France seem to have in common, and that prevails in the literary language of the Middle Ages as well as in modern times. It is a grammatical contrivance that is derived from the Latin, and marks the past, originally the completion, of an action. It is *g*, *gu*, originally pronounced *gw*, from the short, unstressed *u*, in hiatus, in the perfect and pluperfect of many strong verbs in Latin, Classical or Vulgar: TENUI—TENUISSEM, HABUI—HABUISSEM, VALUI—VALUISSEM, \*TOLLUI—\*TOLLUISSEM. This Latin *u*, in hiatus, pronounced *w*, had the same destiny as Germanic *w*, which was changed to *gu*, pronounced *gw*, and finally *g* (*guerra*, *guerro*, "war"). HABUI, HABUISTI, etc., became *ag* or *ac* (*g* = *c*, voiceless, at the end of the word), *aguest*, *ag* or *ac*, *aguem*, *aguets*, *agron*; and HABUISSEM, HABUISSES, etc., became *agues*, *aguesses*, *agues*, *aguessem*, *aguessets*, *aguesson*. The *gu*, *g* of the perfect and pluperfect (= imperfect) subjunctive was introduced, by analogy, already in the Middle Ages, into the past participle of the same class of verbs: *tengut*, *agut*, *valgut*, *tolgut*.

This grammatical contrivance, very popular already in Old Provençal, has had an immense success in the modern language. It has taken possession of the perfect and pluperfect (= imperfect) subjunctive of the large majority of verbs of all conjugations, except the first: *puniguère*—*puniguèsse*, *serviguère*—*serviguèsse*, *rendeguère*—*rendeguèsse*, *couneguère*—*couneguèsse*, *faguère*—*faguèsse*, *diguère*—*diguèsse*, *fuquère* and *siguère*—*fuguèsse* and *siguèsse*, etc. The number of past participles with *g* has been increased: *faugu* (*fallu*), *cousegu* (*cousu*), *móusegu* (*trait*), etc. Moreover, this *g* has invaded the infinitive, the

present participle, and the present subjunctive of some verbs: *agué* = *avé* (*avoir*), *vauqué* = *valé* (*valoir*), *vouqué* = *volé* (*vouloir*), *faugué* = *falé* (*falloir*); *aguènt* = *avènt* (*ayant*), *vouguènt* = *voulènt* (*voulant*); *begue* (*je boive*), *tègue* (*je tienne*), *punigue* (*je punisse*), *ague* (*j'aie*), *siegue* and *fugue* (*je sois*), etc.

There are in modern Provençal many other highly interesting grammatical facts, some of which I will mention without commenting upon them:

The flexion of adjectives, influenced by the laws of linking or *liaison*, for example, *de bèu capèu* (*de beaux chapeaux*)—*mi bèus ami* (*mes beaux amis*), *de tendri cor* (*de tendres cœurs*)—*de tendris amant* (*de tendres amants*);

*ié*, *i* (*y*, *lui*, *leur*), derived from the local adverb, in Latin, *ibi*, and corresponding to *i* or *y* in old Provençal, but also taking the place of the old atonic forms of the dative, sing. and plur., of the third personal pronoun;

The *r*, without Latin and Old Provençal equivalent, in the first and second person, singular and plural, of the perfect of all conjugations, introduced into these forms through analogy with the third person plural of this tense and, perhaps, also with the whole pluperfect indicative (= conditional) in Old Provençal, cp. Modern Provençal, perfect, *vendeguère*, *vendeguères*, *vendeguè*, *vendeguerian*, *vendeguerias*, *vendeguèron*, and Old Provençal, perfect, *vendei*, *vendest*, *vendet*, *vendem*, *vendetz*, *venderon* (Latin *VENDIDERUNT*), and pluperfect indicative, *vendera*, *venderas*, *vendera*, *venderam*, *venderatz*, *venderan* (Latin *VENDIDERAM*, etc.).

Thus far, I have had nothing but praise to bestow upon Prof. Koschwitz's very remarkable book. But it is not astonishing that it contains a few objectionable features. In the first place, I regret the lack of phonetic transcriptions especially in the first part, that treats of phonetics or pronunciation. Koschwitz refers somewhere to some phonetic texts in Bertuch's German translation of *Mirèio*. I hope he will make use of these texts, or give a phonetic transcription of all the words and grammatical forms in the second edition of his grammar. It is true, the spelling of modern Provençal is simple enough and rather consistent, and the author's indications and explanations are on

the whole clear and sufficient in regard to the principal points of pronunciation. Some distinctions, in the spelling, require much attention on the part of the reader. For example, he has to be careful about the correct pronunciation of *u*, *ou*, *ou*, *ou*: *u* is (y), *ou* is (u); and *ou* and *ou* are diphthongs, in which *u* has not the (y)-sound, they are to be pronounced (ou) and (ou) with (u) almost equal or near to (w).

The treatment of diphthongs is unsatisfactory. I object to Koschwitz's "weak diphthongs" altogether. He discovers diphthongs in words like *patrio*, *Mario*, *fiho* (p. 24), because the semi-vowel (j) is heard after (i) in those words. Does he think that there is a diphthong in the French word *vie*, when the actor of the Théâtre-Français pronounces (vi:jə), in rhyme, instead of (vi)? What does Prof. Koschwitz understand by "diphthong"? I miss in his grammar a clear and concise definition of this phonetic term.

According to § 16 (pp. 35, 36), *r*, in modern Provençal, is velar and pronounced like the normal (R) of the Parisians, when it is initial, or followed or preceded by another consonant, or double in the spelling, for example, *roso*, *merma*, *frucho*, *terro*; it is also velar, but more or less weak, when it is final, for example, *flour*, *mar*, *discours* (*s* being silent); but it is a dental (r) and trilled à l'italienne, when it is between two vowels, for example, *ero*, *caramel*. Such, or a similar, phonetic confusion, in regard to (r) and (R), really exists in individual pronunciation in Northern France and, also, in other countries, and may be found sometimes among the well educated *Félibres*, Dr. Koschwitz's Provençal friends, whose pronunciation may be supposed to be a little "Parisianized." But as far as my experience goes, the regular or normal *r*-sound, among the ordinary people, in Provence, is, in every case, a dental or lingual (r), more or less trilled à l'italienne according to its position in words or combinations of words; and this sound seems to me to prevail in the French pronunciation of the people, even of the educated classes, *Félibres* or not *Félibres*, in the towns of Provence. Why should they generally use in some words their natural (r), in others the foreign velar (R), when speaking their native language?

A. RAMBEAU.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### A NEWLY DISCOVERED MS. OF ALISCANS.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—Some of your readers may have heard that a newly discovered MS. of *Aliscans* has been published. Inasmuch as the circumstances surrounding the appearance of this volume are mysterious, it might be of service to state a few facts concerning this matter.

No one seems to know who the owner of the MS. is. In fact, he conceals his identity with the greatest care. The published volume bears no name of editor. The printing was done at the Chiswick Press, London, 1903, and the edition is limited to two hundred copies. The price is about one pound ten shillings. Probably the surest firm to write to in an effort to obtain a copy is Bernard Quaritch. The book is beautifully printed, with red letters at the beginning of the laisses. No attempt has been made to edit the MS., for which we may be thankful.

The title of the poem is: *La Chancun de Wil-lame*. The word *Aliscans* does not exist in the poem, which is indeed what its title indicates. The MS. contains 3553 lines, in assonance, with a peculiar variation of the *vers orphelin* at the end of the laisse. The version of this MS. is by far the oldest that we have preserved in any French source. In spite of numerous corruptions which disfigure the language and versification of the poem, it contains several scenes that deserve to rank among the best in Old French literature. A detailed account of the poem will be found in the October number of the *Romania*.

RAYMOND WEEKS.

University of Missouri.

### A NOTE ON THE MIRACLE PLAYS.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*:

SIRS:—In *Mod. Lang. Notes*, VII, 184 (1892), Dr. Davidson called attention to the similarity of parts of the Play of the *Weavers* of Coventry to the corresponding York Play in the following